

REMARKS

The present amendment is in response to the Office action dated January 23, 2007, where the Examiner has rejected claims 1-7, 9, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). In the present amendment, claims 1, 11, and 12 have been amended and claim 2 has been cancelled without prejudice. Accordingly, claims 1 and 3-12 are pending in the present application with claims 1, 11, and 12 being the independent claims. Reconsideration and allowance of pending claims 1 and 3-12 in view of the amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

A. Rejection of Claims 1-7, 9, and 10 Under 35 USC §103

In the Office Action, claims 1-7, 9, and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious with respect to Richter (DE 1918055A1) in view of Kim (US 2002/0109614).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the combination of the cited references does not achieve claims 1-7, 9, and 10.

Richter disclose a mobile telephone designed to provide a greater advertising effect of a manufacturer or type logo on the mobile telephone. To illuminate the logo, Richter discloses using one or more LEDs (page 5, paragraph 3; page 6, paragraph 6) as the backlighting source. Richter also discloses adding color effects or glow effects to the logo/plastic housing by using fluorescent colorants to the films on the housing or by adding phosphorescent colorants on the housing (page 5, paragraphs 4-5, page 9, paragraph 2). On page 9, paragraph 3, Richter discloses that a more expensive option is to use LED (appears to be typo and should be LCD) or plasma technology (unlike a backlit design) where parts of the logo are formed by active electrooptical elements.

Richter does not disclose, teach, or suggest an electroluminescent panel within the mobile handset and constructed to illuminate at least a portion of the transparent area (claim 1), an electroluminescent panel as a backlighting source located within the housing for enhancing the visibility of the graphical elements (claim 11), nor an electroluminescent panel arranged within the housing so that visible light from the electroluminescent panel is emitted through areas of the housing front portions not covered by the opaque layer (claim 12).

The LEDs, fluorescent/phosphorescent films on the housing, and LCD/plasma technology (as admitted by Richter, "unlike in a backlit design") are not an electroluminescent panel as a backlighting source for enhancing the visibility of the graphical elements.

Kim adds nothing in regard to this missing feature from Richter because Kim does not disclose, teach, or suggest an electroluminescent panel as a backlighting source for enhancing the visibility of the graphical elements.

Therefore, the combination of Kim with Richter does not achieve independent claims 1, 11, and 12. Claims 3-10 add further features to independent claims 1, 11, and 12, further distinguishing these claims from Richter/Kim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

B. Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons, allowance of claims 1 and 3-12 pending in the present application is respectfully requested. If necessary, applicant requests, under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) to extend the period for filing a reply in the above-identified application and to charge the fees for a large entity under 37 CFR 1.17(a). The Director is authorized to charge any additional fee(s) or any underpayment of fee(s) or credit any overpayment(s) to Deposit Account No. 50-3001 of Kyocera Wireless Corp.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: April 20, 2007

/Jonathan T. Velasco/

Jonathan T. Velasco

Reg. No. 42,200

Jonathan T. Velasco
Kyocera Wireless Corp.
Attn: Patent Department
P.O. Box 928289
San Diego, California 92192-8289
Tel: (858) 882-3501
Fax: (858) 882-2485